

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed August 25, 2004. Claims 1-21 were examined in the Office Action. Claims 1-21 were rejected. Claims 1, 3, 8, 9, and 17-19 have been amended to overcome the rejections outlined in the Office Action. No claims have been canceled or added. Applicants assert that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and examination in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. Claim 8 has been amended to establish dependency and antecedent basis. Thus, amended claim 8 particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter regarded as an embodiment of the invention. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,205,214 to Culli et al. (hereinafter Culli) in view of Moss et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,917,899 (hereinafter Moss). Applicants respectfully submit that Culli in view of Moss does not teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' claimed invention as recited in amended independent claims 1, 9, and 18.

Claim 1

Applicants' claimed invention as recited in amended claim 1 is drawn to a system for routing a call made from a calling line resold to a carrier. The system comprises, among other features, a switch coupled to the resold line, the switch being operative to determine at the switch whether the call is from the resold line and to route the call to a hub based on determining the call is from the resold line. Thus, all resold calls received at the switch are routed to the hub. In contrast, Culli teaches SSPs operative to query an ISCP 30 in order to receive instructions at the switch on routing calls. (See Culli, column 11, lines 59-64, column 18, lines 62-67) The Office Action on page 5, line 1 acknowledges that SSP 34 of Culli is analogous to SSP A 18 of Moss. The SSP A 18 of Moss also must query an SCP 24 to receive routing instructions for calls received. Thus, the SSP A 18 of Moss only routes calls to the hub upon receiving routing

instructions from the SCP 24. (See Moss, column 2, lines 30-45). Applicants respectfully submit that Culli in view of Moss teaches away from a switch being operative to determine at the switch whether the call is from the resold line and to route the call to a hub based on determining the call is from the resold line. Neither Culli nor Moss, alone, or in combination teach or suggest a switch operative to route a resold call to a hub based on determining the call is resold at the switch. Thus, Applicants' amended claim 1 is allowable over Culli in view of Moss.

Claim 9

Applicants' claimed invention as recited in amended claim 9 is drawn to, a system, in an intelligent network, for routing a call made from a calling line resold to a carrier. The system comprises, among other features, a first network element operative to determine at the first network element whether the call is from the calling line resold to the carrier and to route the call to a second network element based on determining the call is from the calling line resold to the carrier. As described above with respect to amended claim 1, neither Culli nor Moss alone or in combination teach or suggests a network element operative to both determine at the network element whether a call is from a resold line and route the call based on the determination the call is from a resold line. Thus, Applicants' amended claim 9 is also allowable over Culli in view of Moss.

Claim 18

Applicants' claimed invention as recited in amended claim 18 is drawn to a method for routing a call made from a calling line resold to a service provider. The method comprises, among other features, (1) routing the call to a switch wherein the switch is operative to determine at the switch whether the call is made from the calling line resold to the service provider and (2) routing the call from the switch to a service switching point in response to the switch determining the call is made from the calling line resold.

As described above with respect to amended claims 1 and 9, neither Culli nor Moss alone or in combination teach or suggests routing a call from a switch operative to determine at the switch whether the call is made from a calling line resold to a service provider. and routing the call from the switch to a service switching point in response to the switch determining the call is made from the calling line resold. Thus, Applicants' amended claim 18 is also allowable over Culli in view of Moss.

Dependent Claims

At least because claims 2-8, 10-17 and 19-20 respectfully inherit the language of amended claims 1, 9, and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8, 10-17 and 19-20 are also allowable over Culli in view of Moss for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claims 1, 9, and 18.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

Date: November 24, 2004

By: Murrell W. Blackburn
Murrell W. Blackburn
Reg. No. 50,881

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5041

